

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

OU\_172610

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



★

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 757 1961N / Accession No. 9.75

Author Goetz ; Heimann - Dr.

Title Notes on a collection of historical Golcon  
This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.



NOTES ON A COLLECTION  
OF HISTORICAL PORTRAITS FROM  
GOLCONDA

By  
DR. HERMANN GOETZ

## NOTES ON A COLLECTION OF HISTORICAL PORTRAITS FROM GOLCONDA

By DR. HERMANN GOETZ  
(Kern Institute, Leyden)

THE art of the so-called Amsterdam School, and above all of its greatest exponent, Rembrandt, flashes forth from the realistic art of Old Holland like a glimpse of fairyland. The singular character of this art is not only the result of the spiritualized style of the great master, or of the romantic accessories and the magic chiaroscuro effects which he had learnt from the Italian painters of the counter-reformation and its revival of medieval mysticism.

There is more: a new breath of inspiration had come from the Orient. Even before Rembrandt's days Oriental influence had filtered through from the Mediterranean lands, where wars and diplomacy, piratical raids and peaceful trading voyages had made Moors and Turks into familiar figures both in court life and in pictorial art. Hence we find a tendency to "Orientalism" not only in the work of Rembrandt, but also in that of Jan Lievens, Pieter Lastman, Arent de Gelder, Salomon Koninck, van den Eeckhout, and many others.

Their Oriental tendencies, however, show a quite particular note, as these painters did not confine themselves to copying the conventional types created by the Mediterranean painters. They made a direct study of Eastern manners and objects of art which they met with in the harbours of Holland. It is well known that Rembrandt had a strong inclination to the colony of Jews<sup>1</sup> who had immigrated to Amsterdam from Spain and Portugal. But, on the whole, the direct influence of India, Turkey and Persia is far more obvious. A new phase in the connexions of Western Europe had begun.

The Indies were being opened up to the sea-borne trade of Dutch and British merchants who were establishing their first settlements in the East. The days had passed when the seamen of both nations were content to fare as far as the Iberian peninsula or Muscovy.

This direct contact with the East disclosed a new and glamorous wonderland which was to impress itself on the imagination even of sober Amsterdam, and so to impart fresh life and inspiration to its art. In 1595 the first Dutch ships sailed for the East; in 1604 trade on the Coromandel coast was started at Masulipatam, and the factories of Pulicat and Negapatam were founded in

### Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

1609 and 1610 respectively; in 1616 the factory at Surat was opened and became a centre of trade enterprise on the western coast. Three years later the fourth Governor-General founded Batavia, which has ever since been the capital of the Dutch East Indies. In 1623 the Shâh of Persia officially recognized the Dutch East India Company, and in 1635-36 a mission sent to Agra obtained *firmâns* from the Great Mughal. No regular ambassador was, however, sent to the courts of these rulers until Johan Cunæus went to Isfahân in 1651 and Dirk van Adrichem to Agra in 1662.<sup>2</sup> Though the information about these first steps in diplomacy is still somewhat scanty, it may be confidently assumed that even by this time many *objets d'art*—paintings, weapons, wearing apparel, tapestry and jewellery—had found their way to Amsterdam.

When Rembrandt became insolvent in 1656 the list of his property<sup>3</sup> included items of Indian dresses and pictures of costumes. Certain sketches of his, copied from Indian miniatures, probably date from this period and are well known.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, many Dutch paintings of this period show that the artists had made some study of Indian *objets d'art*. We do not know how these collections were made or what happened to them afterwards. Rembrandt's collection of Indian paintings was perhaps the earliest and most comprehensive on the Continent, but its history remains a mystery from beginning to end. The only person who is known to have had access to the art of the Mughal court of the period is Sir Thomas Roe,<sup>5</sup> who was ambassador of James I. to Jahângîr, but he had come back from India long before the earliest date on which the Indian miniatures copied by Rembrandt could have been painted. There is one François Timmers<sup>2</sup> who might conceivably have acquired them at the period in question—*circa* 1630-40; it was he who procured the first *firmâns* for the Dutch merchants from the court at Agra in 1635-36, and he seems to have had relations with Prince Dârâ Shukh, who was a connoisseur and friendly towards foreigners. Timmers, however, was only a sub-factor, and it is somewhat doubtful whether he could become the owner of such valuable works of art. Even if he did, how did they come into Rembrandt's possession? It has been suggested that Rembrandt obtained them through Abraham Wilmerdonks, one of the seventeen members of the Court of Directors, whose portrait he painted in 1642.<sup>4</sup>

Be that as it may, what became of them after they passed out of Rembrandt's hands? It seems not improbable that they formed part of the collection of Nicholaas Witsen,<sup>6</sup> for many years burgomaster of Amsterdam, and later ambassador to William III. when the latter had become King of England. Witsen was a scholar of repute, an explorer, and a historian; his

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

*Noord- en Oost-Tartarijen* (Northern and Eastern Tartary), first published at Amsterdam in 1692, is even now a very useful work of reference. When first published, at a time when trustworthy data could only be obtained with the greatest difficulty, it was a wonderful achievement of research in Asiatic ethnography and history.<sup>7</sup> In 1728, a few years after the death of Witsen, his collections were, however, put to the hammer and scattered in all directions. The only extant copy of the auction catalogue, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum (23 D.D., 1728),<sup>8</sup> enumerates no less than 370 Indian paintings.

Included in the list are two books of pictures, which might, so far as we can tell from the scanty descriptions given, have contained the miniatures once in Rembrandt's possession (Nos. 6 and 9). This theory finds support in the fact that at that time Indian paintings were very rare, and so large a collection as Witsen's may well have absorbed all that were in the market. We know for certain that Nicolaas Witsen had begun to build up his collection as early as 1664—*i.e.*, a few years after the auction of Rembrandt's worldly goods; and that his father Cornelis in his capacity as a burgomaster had been a party to the lawsuits connected with the artist's difficulties.<sup>9</sup> The book *Noord- en Oost-Tartarijen* does indeed contain some reproductions of Indian miniatures (pp. 215, 426), but they are copied from another album (No. 10 of the catalogue)<sup>10</sup> which some time ago I was fortunate enough to identify in Amsterdam.

There are fragments of a third album in the Louvre.<sup>11</sup> The purchasers—*i.e.*, the Rijksprentenkabinet of Amsterdam and the Musée Napoléon (the Louvre), respectively, bought both from the same source—the Van Buren auction at The Hague (1808).<sup>12</sup>

The importance of these albums lies less in the purely artistic value of the pictures than in their historical interest. Not only are they the only extant survivors of the earliest collections of Oriental paintings preserved in the Netherlands of the seventeenth century which influenced the art of the Amsterdam school,<sup>13</sup> but they are among the very few early instances where we can trace from which particular part of India and in what manner the pictures reached Europe.

These paintings come from Golconda. Some of them, as already related, were reproduced in Witsen's book published in 1693, and some are found among the illustrations to Havart's *Op- en Ondergang van Coromandel*<sup>14</sup> which appeared in the same year. Also a letter, addressed by Professor Hendrik Francken to Witsen in 1692, is still extant, in which he translates the Persian and Portuguese biographies added to the portraits of Emperors, princes, and generals of the Mughal Empire, Sultans and dignitaries of Golconda and Bijapur, and finally of the Shâh of Persia.

The above dates make it probable that they were brought from Golconda

### *Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda*

by the Dutch ambassador Laurens Pit<sup>12</sup> in the summer of 1686, the year preceding the fall of this last independent state of the Deccan, and it can hardly be a matter of accident that the portraits in both volumes so closely correspond to the smallest details in Havart's book<sup>10</sup> that they might almost serve as illustrations of his account of this embassy. There is, moreover, internal evidence in the Amsterdam album that it was painted in this very summer—1686. At the time when the pictures were inserted in our album, Muhammad Ibrāhīm, who had formerly served as a general and a governor under the Sultān of Golconda, had already entered the Mughal service (1686); the chief wazīr, Mādannā, and his brother must have been stripped of their honours and murdered (March, 1686), as their portraits do not bear their titles of rank, while on the other hand Sultān Sikandar of Bijāpur, who had to yield to the Mughals in September of that year, was still on the throne with Sharzah Khān as his prime minister.

Though these portraits are not mentioned in the journal of the Embassy preserved in the Record Office at The Hague, it is probable that the Dutch merchants stationed at the Golconda factory got them for the ambassador. It is a known fact that they had exchanged paintings with the Sultān;<sup>14</sup> and the descriptions in Portuguese, which betray a good knowledge of local affairs, may have been added by the merchants' interpreters, Portuguese Jews who, like Joan van Nyendel, had fled from the Inquisition at Goa.<sup>15</sup>

Laurens Pit's mission was unsuccessful. [The kingdom of Golconda was in a state of complete collapse, and the Mughal Emperor was awaiting the moment when it should be ripe for annexation. Many of the nobles who had served under the Qutb Shāh had become disaffected and had joined the army of Prince Shāh 'Ālam (later the Emperor Bahādūr Shāh I.); and after the cruel assassination of Mādannā the kingdom, torn asunder by warring factions, was left without anyone to give a consistent direction to its foreign policy, such as might have preserved for it some remnant of independence.

While the Dutch mission was at the Golconda court, Bijāpur, the capital of the neighbouring kingdom, was already besieged by a Mughal army. September saw the end of Bijāpur's independence, and only a few months were to elapse before Golconda in turn was invested and had to yield (1687). Its fall meant the end of the medieval Muhammadan civilization which had still been upheld in the south by the states which had sprung from the Bahmānī Empire, when Akbar had already initiated a new era of Indo-Muhammadan history in the north.<sup>16</sup>

All the leading figures of these troublous times pass in review before us

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

in the pages of the two albums—the one in Amsterdam, the other (of which, to be precise, only a few isolated sheets survive) in Paris.

As might be expected, the subjects of many of the portraits are Mughal princes and dignitaries—the Emperor Aurangzeb, overlord of the Golconda Sultāns, his forefathers, his sons, and even his generals commanding in the Deccan. We need not linger over these likenesses of well-known personages or over that of the Persian ruler, Sulaimān II.<sup>16</sup>

Some of the leading figures in the history of the neighbouring state of Bijāpur appear in the series; but here, too, we find exclusively persons who have been connected in some way with Golconda. Among them is Ibrāhīm II. (1580-1626) (fol. 39), an able ruler in whose reign Bijāpur reached its highest pitch of artistic and intellectual achievement, attended, however, by a religious and moral decay which led to the political and cultural decline that set in soon afterwards. His two successors, Muhammad (1627-55) (fol. 40) who had married a Golconda princess and was buried in the imposing Gol Gumbaz, and 'Ali II. (1656-72) (fol. 41), a paralytic debauchee, were unable to uphold their authority against their ministers and court officials. First, Mullā Muhammad Amīn Lārī Mustafā Khān (fol. 43), the *de facto* ruler in Sultān Muhammad's time, was seized by his colleague Khawāss Khān (fol. 42), and imprisoned for a time at Belgaon; in the course of the civil war that followed he was killed before the stronghold of Chenchi in the Carnatic. Khawāss Khān continued to be the virtual ruler of the kingdom till the end of 'Ali's nominal reign, and even during the early part of young Sikandar's reign. In 1675, however, he was overthrown by Bahloī Khān (fol. 44), who in turn was poisoned two years later. In these circumstances the kingdom fell into a state of anarchy so complete that the war with the Mughals in 'Ali II.'s reign might well have ended in the conquest of Bijāpur, if the invading army had not been distracted by the strife arising among Shāhjahān's sons over the succession. In 1684 Sayyid Makhdūm Sharzah Khān (fol. 45), the last minister-regent of Sultān Sikandar, took over the reins of government, but in spite of his energy he and his king had to capitulate in September, 1686. Only one year later Golconda in turn was conquered, and its king went to share young Sikandar's captivity in the Mughal fortress of Daulatābād.

The series depicting the history of Golconda is much more representative. As already remarked, it shows a close affinity to the biographical notes in Havart's *Op- en Ondergang von Coromandel*. This series, too, starts with portraits of the successive kings. The labels describe them as "Shāh"—i.e., emperor, a title which the Deccani rulers gave to themselves, while the Mughal court only allowed them that of "Khān"; this is another reason why the pictures cannot have been the work of a Mughal artist.

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

The first of the series is Burhān 'Ali Barah Mulk (fol. 19A) (Fig. 1), who had been made, in 1495, Governor of Telingāna by Mahmūd, the last ruler of the tottering Bahmani Empire. When this empire fell apart, Qutb-ul-Mulk built up an independent kingdom, which he extended at the expense of Vijayanagar, the last great Hindu power, and of Bijāpur, another state sprung from the Bahmani Empire. It is the portrait of an old, imposing gentleman, an experienced fighter and a skilful judge of men clad in the old-fashioned dress which had been in vogue in Turkestān and Persia under Tamerlane's successors ; and which, to judge from some other early paintings, was also worn in India before the Mughal invasion.

The portraits of his successors show clearly how the line deteriorated and became effeminate. Here we have Ibrāhīm (1550-80) (fol. 19B) (Fig. 2)\*, during whose reign Golconda reached the zenith of its power, Muhammad Quli (1580-1611) (fol. 21), who erected many stately buildings, and Muhammad (1611-25) (fol. 21), who had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Mughals ; finally the last two Qutb-Shāhīs, 'Abdullah (1625-72) (fol. 22<sup>16b</sup> ; Stchoukine, No. 80), and Abul-Hasan (1672-87) (fol. 23 ; Stchoukine, No. 81, Pl. 18<sup>a</sup>), (Fig. 4). These two princes, like the last two 'Ādil-Shāhīs of Bijāpur, had been only puppets in the hands of warring court factions and powerful ministers.

'Abdullah, a patron of the arts and a truly regal figure, made Hyderabad the most luxurious and fashionable city in India ; but his energy was sapped by dissolute harem life, and he was unable to maintain his authority against the military members of his court. His expression, unlike that of his debonair predecessors, betrays a remarkable blend of kingly pride and extravagance with irresolute suspicion and sensitiveness. Abul-Hasan, on the other hand, though distantly related to the ruling family, was a vulgar person. Originally a Darwesh, he had been raised to the throne only to bar the way to an abler rival. Fond of good living and of unstable character, he was treated by his ministers as a prisoner rather than as a ruler.

In the course of 'Abdullah's reign Mīrzā Ahmad (fol. 24. Stch. no. 83), (Fig. 3) a nobleman from Mecca, had seized the reins of government and married a daughter of the king. When, in 1672, the Sultān and his loyal and energetic commander-in-chief, the eunuch Nēknām Khān (fol. 25 ; Stch. no. 89) (Fig. 6), both died, the way to the throne seemed open to the prime minister. But his opponents rose against him ; he was thrown into prison and poisoned, and the crown passed to Abul-Hasan. The leaders in this *coup d'état* were the general Sayyid Muzaffar (fol. 28 ; Stch. no. 84 ; Plate 19A),<sup>16b</sup> Mūsā Khān (fol. 26) (Fig. 7), the cavalry commander, and the "saintly" *bon-vivant* Shāh Rājū (fol. 30 ; Stch. no. 82 ; Plate 19B) (Fig. 8), religious

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

teacher of the new king. The new administration, however, soon became unpopular and was overthrown in the following year, 1673. The king, who had grown discontented with his rôle of *roi fainéant*, entered into a conspiracy with his new private secretary, the Brähman Mädannā (fol. 37 ; Stch. no. 85, Plate 18B),<sup>16</sup> who had been Sayyid Muzaffar's financial deputy ; Muhammad Ibrāhīm (fol. 29 ; Stch. no. 87) too, the new cavalry commander, was drawn in. The prime minister and *de facto* ruler, his nephew, Shāh Mīrzā (fol. 27 ; Stch. no. 90), and Mūsa Khān were arrested and thrown into prison, never to leave it alive. The king's status, however, remained as before ; he had only changed masters ; and the lean and crafty Brähman, whose skilled diplomacy averted the fall of the kingdom for another decade, was not to be easily dislodged. For twelve years he was the absolute ruler of Golconda.

Finally his exactions and the favour that he showed to his Hindu co-religionists brought the Muhammadan officers to such a pitch of exasperation that they murdered him and dragged his mutilated body through the streets of the capital. The same fate befell his brother Akannā (fol. 38 ; Stch. no. 86) (Fig. 5) who, in spite of his cruel and cowardly disposition, had supplanted Muhammad Ibrāhīm in the command of the army when the latter fell into disgrace in 1682 after a defeat by the Bijāpur forces. (He, too, like the survivors of the last *coup d'état*, entered the Mughal service).

The murder of Mädannā led to the downfall of Golconda. Bereft of a single directing hand, weakened by internal strife and undermined by Mughal intrigue, the kingdom was doomed to speedy dissolution. In the very next year the city was besieged and Sultān Abul-Hasan was betrayed into the hands of the Mughals.

Although we know the history of Golconda in its main outlines, our knowledge of its art and social conditions is very sketchy compared with our acquaintance with contemporary Mughal culture. Few writings of this epoch have come down to us, while contemporary European authorities fail to discriminate sufficiently between the different types of civilization then prevalent in India. Mughal pictorial art provides an additional source of information ; but Deccani painting is still an almost unexplored field of research. No two writers are in agreement as to whether a particular miniature or fresco is or is not Deccani, and to what school or period it is to be ascribed.<sup>17</sup> And yet it would be worth while to know more about Deccani civilization, which must have differed greatly from that of Mughal or Rājpūt India.<sup>18</sup>

In the north the cosmopolitan Mughal empire had built up, under its military-bureaucratic system of government, a form of culture blended of Eastern Turkish, Rājpūt and Persian elements. But the states of the south had continued the medieval form of Indo-Muhammadan administration.



FIG. 1.—BURHAN 'ALI BARAH MULK.



FIG. 2.—SULTAN IBRAHIM.



FIG. 3.—MIRZA AHMAD.

Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda.



FIG. 4.—SULTAN ABU'L-HASAN.

Copyright reserved. Nijhoff, Leiden, Amsterdam.

To face p. 5



FIG. 5.—AKANNA.



FIG. 6.—NÎKNAM KHÂN.



FIG. 7.—MUSA KHÂN.



FIG. 8.—SHÂH RÂJU.

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

Their civilization must have been a mixture of Persian, Mameluke Egyptian, Osmānli, and South Indian elements, the last being more akin to ancient Indian tradition than Rājpūt culture.

According to current theories, the paintings here discussed belong to the branch of Mughal art introduced into Hyderabad by the Nizām-ul-Mulk about 1724;<sup>19</sup> but as we have already seen, they date from an earlier time and are products of the Golconda school. Are there other specimens of the same style extant?

In the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris there is an album (O.D. no. 45, *réserve*)<sup>20</sup> of pictures which had been painted at Golconda for the Venetian traveller Nicolao Manucci only a few months later than those with which we are dealing. While the style and composition are similar, some important differences are apparent. As Manucci had ordered an album giving a general idea of the India of his times, most of the very elaborate paintings deal with Mughal history or Indian ethnography in general. Although Manucci tells us that the painter Mīr Muhammad, an artist in Shāh 'Ālam's service, copied them from originals in the Emperor's own library, the Manucci album, in fact, is but a collection of bad though showy pictures of the same style as those in the Amsterdam and Paris<sup>11</sup> albums, and as the isolated portraits of kings and nobles of Golconda—especially Sultān Abul-Hasan<sup>21</sup>—to be found in various collections in London, Bombay, Delhi, Boston, Berlin, etc. But besides Mir Muhammad, other unemployed painters from Golconda seem to have entered the Mughal service during these evil times, for we know of a portrait of Shāh 'Ālam by a Golconda artist.<sup>22</sup> It is therefore hardly surprising that these works should be wrongly ascribed to a Mughal origin, the more so as the style of painting usually classed as "Deccanī" by the Mughal collectors of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries<sup>23</sup> is quite different. The two styles have, however, much in common. Both are characterized by glaring colours, sometimes put side by side without any transitions, bright masses of gold, the absence of a sense for space, and a fondness for exuberant oversized vegetation; and both favour the same particular size and proportion of the paintings. For the rest there is a wide divergence between the two schools, a divergence between two epochs—the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Bijāpur and the last three quarters of the seventeenth at Golconda.

In each also the influence of different phases of Mughal art is to be felt. Take for instance the style of dress at Golconda. The founder of the Qutb Dynasty still wears the costume of the later Timūrid period, which was in vogue in Northern India before and during the early days of Mughal rule (Fig. 1). Then Sultān Ibrāhīm, Muhammad and Muhammad Qulī

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

adopted the Mughal style of Akbar's reign, though with considerable modifications (Fig. 2). 'Abdullah prefers an extravagant imitation of the Persianized fashion of Jahāngīr's days,<sup>16a</sup> which under his successor was more and more assimilated to contemporary Mughal dress.

The phases of artistic development in the Deccan seem to correspond to these changes of fashion. In the British Museum there is a manuscript bearing the title "Nujūm-ul-'Ulūm," written in A.D. 1570 (Chester Beatty, Mughal MS. No. 2), which had been kept for a time in the library of the liberal Sultān Ibrāhīm II. of Bijāpur (1579-1626). This contains miniatures of an early style in which Hindu influence predominates blended with the classic Timūrid art.<sup>24</sup>

In technique and expression these pictures are akin to the Rāgmālās of early Rājasthān, but they are distinguished from the latter in point of size, in a greater wealth of types, *horror vacui*, the lavish use of over-sized floral decoration spread over the background, and the excessive rendering of golden bracelets and similar ornaments both for men and beasts. We may find the counterpart to these Bijāpur pictures in the painted chintzes (*pintados*) of the Coromandel coast with their strange mixture of Persian, "Rājpūt," and South Indian (Vijayanagar) elements.<sup>25</sup> From the beginning of the seventeenth century this "Hindu" style fell out of favour at the courts, and was soon reduced to the position of a provincial school of art.<sup>26, 27</sup> It crops up, however, occasionally in both kingdoms throughout the century, shaping itself more and more in course of time on the pattern of the new styles developing in the capitals. Among the latest specimens of this style are a portrait of the young Sultān Abul-Hasan ("Tānā Shāh") and some female portraits of a markedly erotic character, which may depict courtesans of the final phase of luxurious Golconda.<sup>28</sup>

After the conquest of Khāndesh and Ahmadnagar by Akbar, the neighbouring kingdom of Bijāpur came under the influence of the new art which had sprung up under the auspices of that great prince. As early as the latter part of Ibrāhīm II.'s reign the artists of Bijāpur adopted the technique and outward form of the Akbari school; they did not, however, grasp the conception underlying it. This style is, like the earlier one, characterized by a missing sense of spate, bright gold and glowing colour, and oversized ornamental flowers spread over the whole picture; it is this style which the Mughal collectors of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries called "Deccani Qālam." But with the rapid decay of the kingdom which set in after Ibrāhīm's death the "classical" phase of this Bijāpuri art came to an end.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>16a</sup> Apparently feuds between the different coteries made any continuity of

### Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

art tradition impossible. Works of art of the most divergent types are to be found side by side. The styles are so varied that there might be no clue to the place and date of origin if it were not that all the representations of costume, furniture, buildings, etc., point to Bijāpur during Sultān Muhammad's reign. The paintings no doubt betray to a certain extent a common mentality: The outline is less agitated and less emphasized, colours are more restrained, and sentiment more delicate, but in every other respect the most diverse influences have been at work. Some paintings must be associated with the art of Shāh Jahān's court,<sup>30</sup> others with that of Persia under the later Safavid kings,<sup>31</sup> others with the Portuguese of Goa, such as the remarkable "Italian" frescoes in the Ashār Mahall.<sup>32</sup> Under the last two Sultāns the art of Bijāpur seems to have finally died out; all that survives are some doubtful portraits in a sort of debased Mughal style.

It was at this period, however, that the conception of a "Deccanī" style became associated with the art of Golconda—the art of the books of pictures in Amsterdam, in the Louvre,<sup>10</sup> and in the British Museum,<sup>11</sup> as well as that of the Codex Manucci.<sup>20</sup> All the datable products of this school belong to the times of Sultān Abul-Hasan. There is, however, every reason to believe that this school originated under his predecessor 'Abdullah, during whose reign Golconda art was strongly influenced by that of the Emperor Jahāngīr's and, to a less extent, that of Shāh Jahān's court. In this way many characteristics of early Mughal life in Jahāngīr's times have passed over into the decaying civilization of the reigns of Farrukhsiyar (1712-18) and Muhammad Shāh (1718-48) by way of Golconda. Bijāpur, too, similarly handed down certain features of early Mughal civilization to eighteenth-century Rājpūtānā.

This Golconda school is marked by a certain poverty of subjects in its pictures, most of which are portraits, but the style is livelier than that of contemporary Mughal art. Outlines are bold and strongly marked, the colours bright, much use is made of gold, often rather crudely, and there is a tendency to exaggerate the facial features. Later works show even a certain lifeless dryness. Only the pictures of the Manucci Codex have more elaborate themes, with accessories in the manner of Rājpūt art. Is it possible that here, too, the Deccanī school acted as a connecting link between certain characteristics of sixteenth and eighteenth century Rājpūt art? This album is the last product of Golconda art and testifies to its rapid decline. Outlines are harsh and over-emphasized to the point of caricature, and the tints are showy but crude.

I must admit that I do not know of any paintings of real artistic worth which can be ascribed to the Nizām period, although of course there may be many in existence but not yet brought to notice. Those that I have seen—

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

mostly in the hands of art dealers—were works of no artistic merit, belonging to the period when the Bärha Sayyids governed the Deccan—i.e., the second decade of the eighteenth century.<sup>24</sup>

There seems, therefore, to be every reason to believe that the school of painting hitherto classed as an offshoot of Mughal art in the Nizām's dominions was really the last and perhaps one of the best schools of the distinctive Deccani work, and flourished during the reigns of the last two rulers of Golconda.

### REFERENCES.

<sup>1</sup> Werner Weissbach, *Rembrandt*, Leipsic, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> J. H. Heeres, *Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlands-Indicum*, I., 1907; II., 1931. Terpstra, *Vestiging van de Nederlanders aan de Kust van Koromandel*, 1911.

<sup>3</sup> Hofstede de Groot, *Rembrandt*. Urkunden über f. den Haag, 1906.

<sup>4</sup> F. Sarre in *Jahrbuch der Kgl. Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, 1904, 1909. Valentiner, *Rembrandt. Handzeichnungen*, II, 1934.

<sup>5</sup> W. Foster, *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe*, London, 1926.

<sup>6</sup> J. F. Gebhard, *Het Leven van Mr. Nicolaas Cornelisz Witsen*, Utrecht, 1881-82.

<sup>7</sup> In his book is also the first illustration of one of those "Siberian Bronzes" in which connoisseurs of Far Eastern Art are now so much interested.

<sup>8</sup> I have to thank Mr. J. Q. van Regteren-Altena, Amsterdam, for kindly giving me this reference.

<sup>9</sup> It was Professor J. Ph. Vogel of the Leyden University who first directed my attention to this album.

<sup>10</sup> I. Stchoukine, *Les Miniatures Indiennes au Musée du Louvre*, Paris, 1929. Mr. Stchoukine has been the first to suggest that there might be some connection between the Golconda miniatures in the Louvre and the account of Havart.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the auction catalogue Scheurleer in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Leyden.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. also E. Schierlitz, *Die bildlichen Darstellungen der indischen Göttertrinität in der alten ethnographischen Literatur*, 1927. Many illustrations in seventeenth-century books on the East, like those of Thomas Roe, Tavernier, Havart, Baldaeus, Valentijn, are undoubtedly copies of Indian paintings slightly adapted to European taste.

<sup>13</sup> For a detailed description of this embassy cf. Havart.

<sup>14</sup> Manucci, *Storia do Mogor*, ed. W. Irvine, London, 1907.

<sup>15</sup> For the history of the Deccan cf. Jadunath Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb*, Calcutta, 1925; A. A. Bilgrami, *Landmarks of the Deccan*, Hyderabad, 1927; Cousens, *Guide to Bijapur*, Poona, 1905; the same, *Bijapur and its Architectural Remains*, Bombay, 1916; Moreland, *Relations of Golconda in the early Seventeenth Century*, London, 1931.

<sup>16</sup> The portraits of Timūr and Sulaimān II. are reproduced in Witsen's *Noord- en Oost-Tartarijen*, pp. 215, 426. Through the carelessness of the Jewish-Portuguese interpreters the picture of Sulaimān II. has been wrongly explained as that of his better-known ancestor 'Abbās the Great. Witsen has tried to reconcile the two descriptions by assuming that it represents 'Abbās II., who received the embassy of Cunaeus.

<sup>16a</sup> Reproduced in *Maandblad voor Beeldenden Kunsten*, XI., pp. 310 ff., Amsterdam, 1934.

<sup>17</sup> I. Stchoukine, *La Peinture Indienne à l'Époque des Grand-Moghols*, 1929, p. 64.

<sup>18</sup> H. Goetz, *Bilderatlas zur Kulturgeschichte Indiens in der Grossmoghuleit*, 1930.

## Notes on a Collection of Historical Portraits from Golconda

<sup>19</sup> P. Brown, *Indian Painting*, Calcutta-London s.a.; O. C. Gangoly, in *Rūpam*, No. 4, p. 16 ff., 1920.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Nicolao Manucci, *Storia do Mogor*, Introduction.

<sup>21</sup> Bilgrami, *Landmarks*; Gladstone Solomon, *Essays on Moghul Art*, London-Bombay, 1932. Cp. also J. Strzygowski, *Asiatische Miniaturmalerei*, Klagenfurt, 1933, pp. 21 sq., and Plates 13-15. Professor Glück has made the interesting observation that some of the miniatures in the National Library of Vienna and in Schönbrunn Palace, apparently acquired in 1762, betray a striking resemblance with the sketches executed by Rembrandt. As several of these pictures are accompanied by Dutch inscriptions, it seems very probable that they too were originally a part of the Witsen Collection sold in 1728.

<sup>22</sup> Coomaraswamy, Boston Catalogue, Vol. VI., Plate 58.

<sup>23</sup> Mehta, *Studies in Indian Painting*, 1926, Plate 47, etc.

<sup>24</sup> L. Binyon in *Rūpam*, No. 29, pp. 4 ff., 1924.

<sup>25</sup> Baker, *Calico Painting and Printing in the East Indies*, London, 1921; O. C. Gangoly in *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 1919; St. Culin in *Good Furniture Magazine*, New York, XI, pp. 133 ff.; J. Breck, *Metropolitan Museum Studies*, New York, I., Pt. I.; *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, XX., No. 6, 1925.

<sup>26</sup> Coomaraswamy, Boston Catalogue, VI., Plate 50.

<sup>27</sup> Coomaraswamy in *Artibus Asiae*, 1927, I., pp. 9 ff., Fig. 4.

<sup>28</sup> *Eastern Art*, II., Fig. 16, Philadelphia, 1930; Gangoly in *Rūpam*, No. 4, 1920, pp. 16 ff. The fact that these women wear a purely Indian costume is sufficient to exclude any identification with ladies of a Muhammadan court. Moreover, respectable women would never have been represented in a pose like that of the painting in Berlin.

<sup>29</sup> Mehta, *Studies*, Plate 47; Kühnel, *Miniaturmalerie im Islamischen Orient*, 1922, Plate 104. For a later reminiscence of *Artibus Asiae*, 1927, I., pp. 9 ff., Fig. 5.

<sup>30</sup> E. Blochet, *Les Enluminures des Mss. Orientaux de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 1926, Plate 109.

<sup>31</sup> Coomaraswamy, Boston Catalogue, Vol. VI., Plate 39.

<sup>32</sup> Cousens, *Bijapur and its Architectural Remains*, pp. 89 ff., Plates 75, 76.

<sup>33</sup> Rieu, Catalogue of Persian MSS., British Museum: Add. 5254, Add. 7964, Add. 22-282; Bilgrami, *Landmarks*; J. N. Sarkar, *Shivaji and his Times*, 1929.

<sup>34</sup> J. Fr. Lewis, *Paintings and Drawings of Persia and India*, Philadelphia, 1924, Nos. 375, 406, catalogues Mensing, Amsterdam, and Maggs Bros., London.



